

SESSION #9
2018-01-12
FM2-124

Notes: Nisa and I reviewed constructions I created that Nisa checked with a woman named Sari, from her community. Nisa and I reviewed Sari's judgments on these constructions, and Nisa also gave her judgments. Nisa's recording session with Sari occurred on December 23, 2017. These constructions are investigating the question of whether P, R, and T are equally accessible to syntactic operations (especially across AV and PV).

SECTION 1: Interpreting fronted P, R, T

-Takeaways:

- I think A and P cannot be pre-verbal. P can be fronted when A is cliticized after the verb, but not when A is cliticized before the verb.
- When P is fronted in AV and A is moved after the verb, it can change the meaning of the utterance to an imperative (1b)
- R can be fronted for sure in PV. R can be fronted in borderline AV/PV if R is specified with DEM.
- T looks like it can be fronted in PV too.

(1a)	Kanak bau paoq	(1b)	Paoq bau kanak
	'A child picked a mango'		? 'A child picked a mango'

-Straight-up AV constructions are compared here. Nisa reports it's more likely for (1a) to be in spoken language, whereas switching the order of A and P in (1b) is more like an imperative 'Go pick the mango, child'.

(2a)	Bau=ne paoq	(2b)	Paoq bau=ne
	? 'S/he picks a mango'		'S/he picks a mango'

-Here we have a borderline case of AV/PV, where the A is cliticized but there is no *siq*-phrase. Both are basically OK, but (2a) feels "not yet done", and (2b) feels more like a complete utterance. I think the problem with (2a) is that the P is not fronted after the A has been cliticized ... so fronting the P as in (2b) makes it clear and complete as a PV construction. I wonder if (2a) is also not great because both arguments are on the same side of the verb.

(2c)	Bau=ne paoq siq Nisa
	? 'Nisa picks a mango'

-Here the PV status of the construction in (2a) is clear, because I added *siq Nisa*, but Nisa says this still feels incomplete, like something should come after "Nisa". So pre-verbal P in PV is preferred.

(2d)	Paoq bau=ne siq Nisa (2d is better than 2c)
	'Nisa picks a mango'

-Here we have a clear case of P fronted in PV, and Nisa reports in (2d) that "*paoq* is the focus"

(3a) Wah=ne bau paoq
'S/he picked a mango'

(3b) Wah=ne paoq bau
*S/he picked a mango'

-Another borderline AV/PV case, because there is no *siq*-phrase. Unlike (2a), though, (3a) is good. I wonder if this is because A and P are on different sides of the verb. This analysis may be supported by the fact that Nisa says (3b) is "ill-formed". There the A and P are both pre-verbal.

(4a) Siq=ne bau paoq siq kanak no
'The child picks a mango'

(4b) Siq=ne paoq bau siq kanak no
*The child picks a mango'

-Here we are clearly in PV, as indicated by the *siq*-phrases. (4a) is OK, but (4b) is ill-informed. Again, maybe that's because fronted P is on the same side of the verb as cliticized A.

(5a) Dagang no bèng kanak kembang
'The seller gives a child a flower'

(5b) Kembang dagang no bèng kanak

-Moving on to ditransitives in AV now. AVRT order in (5a) is OK. Nisa will double-check with the audio file for (5b), where we have TAVR order

(6a) Dagang no bèng kanak kembang
'The seller gives a child a flower'

(6b) Kanak dagang no bèng kembang

-(6a) is OK ... but (6b) is "ill-formed". So clearly no fronting of R is permitted into RAVT order in AV.

(7a) Bèng=ne kanak no kembang
'She gave the child a flower'

(7b) Kembang bèng=ne kanak
*She gave the child a flower'

-Here we have a borderline AV/PV case, because there's no *siq*-phrase. (7a) is OK, where A, R, and T are all post-verbal. (7b) is not OK, but it's not because T is fronted. Instead, it's because R is not specified: To make (7b) acceptable you have to make *kanak* specific with DEM *no*, as in (7c).

(7c) Kembang bèng=ne kanak no
'It was a flower that she gave the child'

-Here the T is fronted in a borderline AV/PV case, but Nisa has provided a different translation. I think we're looking at topicalization, because Nisa says "in the speaker's mind the flower always comes first", when *kembang* is fronted. In (7a), *kanak* is more the focus, but in (7c) *kembang* is more focused.

(8a) Bèng=ne kanak kembang
'she gave a child a flower'

(8b) Kanak bèng=ne kembang
'it was a child she gave a flower'

-Another borderline AV/PV case, where there is no *siq*-phrase. Sari said (8a, b) are equal, but Nisa says there's "still more a different focus". Nisa thinks it's a bit different. In (8b), the *kanak* is "more prominent". I think it's the same pattern as (7c): Fronting R or T in these borderline AV/PV cases probably produces a topicalization. But that's not the same case with P in (2b), I think.

(9a) Kanak bèng dagang kèpèng

(9b) Dagang kanak bèng kèpèng

'A child gives a seller money'

-Here we have AV constructions. (9a) is okay, (9b) is not (Nisa's speaker "hated it"). Can't put the R before the A in AV.

(9c) Kanak bèng dagang no kèpèng

'The child gives the seller money'

(9d) Dagang no kanak no bèng kèpèng

? 'The child gives the seller money'

-OK, (9c) is "beautiful" because it has R with DEM. (10a) shows the same construction with no DEM specifying A.

-(9d) is improved from (9b), but the RAVT word order where R is fronted before A is still dispreferred. Instead, it makes Nisa want to create a relative clause via *saq* would make it better, as in (9e)

(9e) Né dagang saq kanak no bèng kèpèng

'This is the seller that the child gave the money'

-This is also a good example of R being extracted from an AV clause

(10a) Kanak bèng dagang no kèpèng

'A child gave the seller money'

(10b) Dagang no bèng=ne kèpèng

'It's the seller that he gave the

money'

-(10a) is OK "without any context". (10b), however, is a borderline AV/PV case and is OK only if *no* is present with *dagang*. So you can front R in borderline AV/PV if R is specified, but it creates a cleft/topicalized reading.

(10c) Dagang no bèng=ne kèpèng siq kanak no

'A child gave the seller money'

-Here the borderline case from (10b) is no longer borderline: It's clearly PV because we now have a *siq*-phrase. In fact, Nisa jokingly said (10c) is "beautiful ... I'm so touched".

(11a) Kanak bèng dagang kèpèng

'child gives a seller money'

(11b) Kèpèng kanak bèng dagang

*'child gives a seller money'

-Back to AV constructions. Sari says (11a) is totally OK, but Nisa prefers a DEM with the agent *kanak*.

-Fronting the T in AV is not allowed: (11b) is ill-formed, b/c 'money' is interpreted as the agent

(11c) Kèpèng no kanak bèng dagang

-(11c) is still not OK, again because 'money' is still the agent

(12a) Kanak bèng dagang kèpèng

'A child gave a seller money'

(12b) Kèpèng bèng=ne dagang

-(12a) is still OK, because it's the same as (11a). (12b) is another borderline case, and the T is fronted. Nisa says it's OK but feels incomplete.

(12c) Kèpèng no bèng=ne dagang

'S/he gave a seller money'

-Nisa says this one is better than (12b), likely because the fronted T is specified.

(12d) Kèpèng bèng=ne dagang siq kanak no

‘A child gave a seller money’

-Here we have Nisa says this is “better” than (12b): “It’s more the topic is on *kèpèng*”. So here we have a fronted T in a clear PV construction, due to *siq*-phrase. Nisa says it’s OK.